REMARKS

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaki U.S. Patent 5,995,454 in view of Tran et al. U.S. Patent 5,224,010; Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tomiyasu in view of Tran et al.; Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaki U.S. Patent 5,995,454 in view of Stapleton et al U.S patent 6,574,577; Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaki U.S. Patent 5,995,454 in view of Mar et al. U.S. Patent 6,792,553.

Regarding Claim 1, applicant points out that claim 1 has been amended from the previous office action to include all the limitations of claim 2. The claim rejections above presented by the Examiner are therefore moot in light of the provided amendments.

Specifically, claim 1 now includes the limitation "enabling the System Control Interrupt (SCI) bit in a Southbridge chipset of the computer; wherein the Southbridge chipset responds to a matching signal sent from the RTC/NVRAM chip when the computer is off." The Examiner had rejected this specific limitation in claim 2 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaki applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Lin et al. US 20030095044, asserting that Lin et al. "teach enabling the SCI bit in a Southbridge chip set of the computer". However, the applicant respectfully disagrees.

Although Lin does mention the Southbridge chipset in the context of "the receiver 20 will send out a signal to the chipset 12, or the Southbridge and Northbridge" in [0026], Lin does not in explicitly teach <u>enabling the SCI bit in the Southbridge chipset</u> (emphasis added) as asserted by the Examiner. In fact, Lin's use of the chipset as described in [0026] inherently assumes that the SCI bit is already enabled such that the Southbridge can receive the signal from the receiver. The Applicant points out that mere use of the Southbridge chipset does not constitute enabling of the SCI bit of the Southbridge chipset

for operation. Because Lin does not specifically teach enabling the SCI bit in the Southbridge chipset, applicant asserts that the teachings of Yamaki applied to Lin do not teach the limitations described in currently amended claim 1.

Additionally, applicant points out that a proper motivation for combining the teachings of Yamaki and Lin are lacking in the current office action. The Examiner has stated in the rejection for claim 2 that the motivation is because "the Southbridge chipset is well known in the art of computer architect". The applicant points that this statement is insufficient because it does not present an advantage or logical rationale for such a combination of inventions. Mere knowledge of a well known component does not necessarily imply application of that component within a specific context. In fact, applicant points out that there is no proper motivation for doing such, as combining the teachings of Yamaki and Lin would conversely be detrimental to operation of their respective individual inventions.

Lin teaches a security apparatus applied to portable computers meant to "disable access to the notebook computer, or turn off the notebook computer by different control commands" in [0016] when the security of the notebook has been breached or compromised, and further elaborates in [0027] "the receiver 20 sends out a signal to the chipset 12, to disable access to the notebook computer...At the same time, if the notebook computer is turned off, the method of this embodiment is completed". However, Yamaki teaches a method for automatically self starting a computer system "that the system is to be started automatically by determining whether or not the specified hours, minutes has already passed the actual hours, minutes at the point in time at which the user specified the time" (Abstract). Given both inventions, there conceivably exists a condition such that a user may want to automatically self start a computer at a predetermined time in the future, where the security of the computer may have been coincidentally and unknowingly breached. Because Lin teaches disabling (or turning off) the computer in such a condition, incorporating the teachings of Yamaki would be counterproductive as

the computer would be allowed to self-start in spite of the security breach. Such a hypothetical situation therefore teaches against combining the respective teachings above, as it could conceivably allow an unauthorized user to access the electronic system of Lin in spite of a security violation.

In summary, applicant points out that Lin does not specifically teach "enabling the SCI bit in the Southbridge chipset" as stated in the limitation for claim 1. Additionally, applicant asserts that there is no proper motivation to combine the teachings of Lin and Yamaki, as such a combination could possibly bypass a security breach in the electronic apparatus of Lin. In addition, none of the other cited prior art references teach enabling the SCI bit in the Southbridge chipset, as is recited in the currently amended claim 1. For at least the above reasons, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of claim 1 for its allowance

Claims 2-3, 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaki applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Lin et al. US 20030095044;

The limitations of claim 2 have been included into currently amended claim 1, with claim 2 subsequently canceled.

Claim 3 has been amended reflect the above cancellation and draw dependence from base claim 1.

Applicant points out that claims 3 and 5 are now both dependent on pending claim 1 above. Therefore, should an allowance be made for claim 1, applicant asserts that allowances should equally be made for claims 3 and 5 as being dependent on base claim 1.

Claims 4, 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tomiyasu in view of Tran et al.

Applicant points out that claims 4, 7-9 are all dependent upon claim 1 individually or through intervening claims. Therefore, should an allowance be made for claim 1 above, applicant asserts that allowances be equally made for claims 4, 7-9 as being dependant through claim 1 above.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Sincerely yours,

Date: Dec. 14, 2006

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526
P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.
Voice Mail: 302-729-1562
Facsimile: 806-498-6673
e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 13 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 10 PM in Taiwan.)